is one of the most powerful weapons that any Senator can wield in this body, and in its stealth version, known as the ''secret hold,'' it is far more potent and far more insidious.

The ''hold'' in the Senate is a lot like the seventh inning stretch in baseball: there is no official rule or regulation that talks about it, but it has been observed for so long that it has become a tradition.

Today, Senator GRASSLEY and I are resubmitting the resolution we sponsored in the 107th Congress to amend the Senate Rules to require that any Senator who wishes to object to a measure or matter publish that objection in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 48 hours. The resolution does not in any way limit the privilege of any Senator to place a ''hold'' on a measure or matter. It is the anonymous hold that is so odious to the basic premise of our democratic system: that the exercise of power always should be accompanied by public accountability. Our resolution would bring the anonymous hold out of the shadows of the Senate. The resolution would assure that the awesome power possessed by an individual Senator to stop legislation or a nomination should be accompanied by public accountability.

Beginning in 1997 and again in 1998, the United States Senate voted unanimously in favor of amendments Senator GRASSLEY and I offered to require that a notice of intent to object be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 48 hours. The amendments, however, never survived conference.

So we took our case directly to the leadership at that time, and to their credit, TOM DASCHLE and TRENT LOTT agreed it was time to make a change. They recognized the significant need for more openness in the way the United States Senate conducts its business so TOM DASCHLE and TRENT LOTT sent a joint letter in February 1999, to all Senators setting forth a policy requiring ''all Senators wishing to place a hold on any legislation or executive calender business [to] notify the sponsor of the legislation and the committee of jurisdiction of their concerns.'' The letter said that ''written notification should be provided to the respective Leader stating their intentions regarding the bill or nomination,'' and that ''holds placed on items by a member of a personal or committee staff will not be honored unless accompanied by a written notification from the objecting Senator by the end of the following business day.''

At first, this action by the Leaders seemed to make a real difference. Many Senators were more open about their holds, and staff could no longer slap a hold on a bill with a quick phone call. But after six to eight months, the clouds moved in on the sunshine hold and the Senate began to slip back towards the old ways. Abuses of the ''holds'' policy began to proliferate, staff-initiated holds-by-phone began anew, and it wasn't too long before legislative gridlock set in and the Senate seemed to have forgotten what Senators DASCHLE and LOTT had tried to do.

My own assessment of the situation now, which is not based on any scientific evidence, GAO investigation or CRS study, is that a significant number of our colleagues in the Senate have gotten the message sent by the Leaders, and have refrained from the use of secret holds. They inform sponsors about their objections, and do not allow their staff to place a hold without their approval. My sense is that the legislative gridlock generated by secret holds may be attributed to a relatively small number of Senate offices. The resolution we are submitting today will not be disruptive for a solid number of Senators, but it will up the ante on those who may be ''chronic abusers'' of the Leaders' policy on holds.

The requirement for public notice of a hold two days after the intent has been conveyed to the leadership may prove to be an inconvenience but not a hardship. No Senator will ever be thrown in jail for failing to give public notice of a hold. Senators routinely place statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recognizing the achievements of a local Boys and Girls Club, or congratulating a local sports team on a State championship. Surely the intent of a Senator to block the progress of legislation or a nomination should be considered of equal importance.

I have adhered to a policy of publicly announcing my intent to object to a measure or matter. This practice has not been a burden or inconvenience. On the contrary, my experience with the public disclosure of holds is that my objections are usually dealt with in an expeditious manner, thereby enabling the Senate to proceed with its business.

Although this is not the ''high season'' for holds, the time is not far off when legislation will become bogged down in the swamp of secret holds. The practice of anonymous multiple or rolling holds is more akin to legislative guerilla warfare than to the way the Senate should conduct its business.

It is time to drain the swamp of secret holds. The resolution we submit today will be referred to the Senate Committee on Rules. It is my hope that the Committee will take this resolution seriously, hold public hearings on it and give it a thorough vetting. This is one of the most awesome powers held by anyone in American government. It has been used countless times to stall and strangle legislation. It is time to bring accountability to the procedure and to the American people, and to put sunshine holds in the Senate Rules.

SENATE RESOLUTION 152—WELCOMING THE PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES, EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES FOR ITS STRONG COOPERATION WITH THE UNITED STATES IN THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST TERRORISM AND ITS MEMBERSHIP IN THE COALITION TO DISARM IRAQ, AND REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF CONGRESS TO THE CONTINUOUS EXPANSION OF FRIENDSHIP AND COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. LUGAR (for himself and Mr. BIDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 152

Whereas the United States and the Philippines have shared a special relationship as close friends for more than a century;

Whereas the United States and the Philippines have been allies for more than 50 years under the Mutual Defense Treaty which was signed at Washington on August 30, 1951 (3 UST 3947);

Whereas the United States and the Philippines share a common commitment to democracy, human rights, and freedom;

Whereas the United States and the Philippines share a common goal of bringing peace, stability and prosperity to the Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas the President of the Philippines, Her Excellency Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, was the first leader in Asia to commit full support for the United States and its war against global terror after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas the Governments of the United States and the Philippines have effectively joined forces to combat the terrorist threat in Southeast Asia and are collaborating on a comprehensive political, economic, and security program designed to defeat terrorist threats in the Philippines, including those from Muslim extremists, Communist insurgents and international terrorists;

Whereas the Governments of the United States and the Philippines believe that, in light of growing evidence that links exist between entities in the Philippines and international terrorist groups, the two countries should enhance their cooperative efforts to combat international terrorism;

Whereas the Government of the United States welcomes and will assist the efforts of the Government of the Philippines to forge a lasting peace, protect human rights, and promote economic development on the island of Mindanao;

Whereas President Arroyo has fully supported the United States position on Iraq, including joining the coalition to enact change in Iraq and arranging to send a humanitarian contingent to help the newly liberated people of that country;

Whereas the United States welcomes the strong statements by President Arroyo on the need for North Korea to accept international norms on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas the United States fully supports the campaign of President Arroyo to implement economic and political reforms and to build a strong Republic in the Philippines to defend Philippine democracy from terror and to strengthen the Philippines as an ally of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate

(1) welcomes the President, Her Excellency Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, to the United States;

(2) expresses profound gratitude to the Government and the people of the Philippines for the expressions of support and sympathy provided after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, and for the Philippines' strong cooperation in the on-going war against global terrorism, membership in the coalition to disarm Iraq, and assistance in helping to rebuild that country; and

(3) reaffirms its commitment to the continued expansion of friendship and cooperation between the Governments and the people of the United States and the Philippines.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED & PROPOSED

SA 757. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. TALENT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

SA 758. Mr. DASCHLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 759. Mr. NELSON, of Florida proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050, supra.

SA 760. Mr. COCHRAN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. NELSON, of Nebraska, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BOND, and Mr. NELSON, of Florida) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 761. Mr. GRAHAM, of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. MILLER, and Mrs. CLINTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 762. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. VOINOVICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 763. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1050, supra.

SA 764. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 765. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. REED, and Mr. BIDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra.

SA 766. Mr. NELSON, of Florida (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050, supra.

SA 767. Mr. NELSON, of Florida (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050, supra.

SA 768. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 769. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 770. Mr. DODD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 771. Mr. DODD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 772. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 773. Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 774. Mr. HARKIN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050 , supra.

SA 775. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 776. Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mr. ALLEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050, supra.

SA 777. Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself and Mr. DEWINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 778. Mr. McCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 779. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra.

SA 780. Mr. McCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 781. Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 782. Mr. VOINOVICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 783. Mr. McCAIN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050 , supra.

SA 784. Mr. CHAMBLISS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra.

SA 785. Mr. DODD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 786. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 787. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 788. Mr. SANTORUM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 789. Mr. BUNNING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 790. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 791. Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1050, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 792. Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050 , supra.

SA 793. Mr. LEVIN (for Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. BYRD, and Mr. LAUTENBERG)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050, supra.

SA 794. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr . BAYH)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050, supra.

SA 795. Mr. WARNER (for Mr. ROBERTS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050, supra.

SA 796. Mr. LEVIN (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for himself and Mr. STEVENS)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050, supra.

SA 797. Mr. LEVIN (for Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050, supra.

SA 798. Mr. WARNER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 757. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. TALENT, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1050, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 222, between the matter following line 12 and line 13, insert the following:

SEC. 866. CONSOLIDATION OF CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 10.—(1) Chapter 141 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2381 the following new section:

"§ 2382. Consolidation of contract requirements: policy and restrictions

''(a) POLICY.—The Secretary of Defense shall require the Secretary of each military department, the head of each Defense Agency, and the head of each Department of Defense Field Activity to ensure that the decisions made by that official regarding consolidation of contract requirements of the department, agency, or field activity, as the case may be, are made with a view to providing small business concerns with appropriate opportunities to participate in Department of Defense procurements as prime contractors and appropriate opportunities to participate in such procurements as subcontractors.

''(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF ACQUISITION STRATEGIES INVOLVING CONSOLIDATION.—(1) An official of a military department, Defense Agency, or Department of Defense Field Activity may not execute an acquisition strategy that includes a consolidation of contract requirements of the military department, agency, or activity with a total value in excess of $5,000,000, unless the senior procurement executive concerned first—

''(A) conducts market research;

''(B) identifies any alternative contracting approaches that would involve a lesser degree of consolidation of contract requirements; and

''(C) determines that the consolidation is necessary and justified.

''(2) A senior procurement executive may determine that an acquisition strategy involving a consolidation of contract requirements is necessary and justified for the purposes of paragraph (1) if the benefits of the acquisition strategy substantially exceed the benefits of each of the possible alternative contracting approaches identified under subparagraph (B) of that paragraph. However, savings in administrative or personnel costs alone do not constitute, for such purposes, a sufficient justification for a consolidation of contract requirements in a procurement unless the total amount of the cost savings is expected to be substantial in relation to the total cost of the procurement.

''(3) Benefits considered for the purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) may include cost and, regardless of whether quantifiable in dollar amounts—

''(A) quality;

''(B) acquisition cycle;

''(C) terms and conditions; and

''(D) any other benefit.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section: